



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,028	09/28/2001	Maurice Granger	1759.053	4669

7590 04/14/2003

John Pietrangelo
Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/966,028

Applicant(s)
Granger

Examiner
Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit
3724



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. John Pietrangelo

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 11, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: proposed claims 16, 17

Identification of prior art discussed:

Fleischauer, pn 3,961,700

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Pietrangelo faxed proposed claims (attached in file) to define the claimed invention over the prior art. Mr. Dexter stated that the proposed claims, particularly independent claim 16, is very broad and is not necessarily limited to a paper towel dispenser such as that disclosed in the present application because there is no such limiting structure (e.g., roll holder) recited in the claim. Mr. Dexter noted that proposed claim 16 may still be taught or considered to be obvious over Fleischauer. Mr. Dexter further stated that such a claim would likely raise new issues as requiring further consideration and/or search. Mr. Dexter suggested adding structure in the claims which would limit the invention to a dispenser. Applicant will further consider the Examiner's position.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.